

Read the text and answer the questions:

From conflict resolution to reconciliation

by Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov

Although conflict resolution terminates a conflict, it does not necessarily stabilize the peace or prevent the emergence of a new conflict in the future, which may even lead to renewed violence.

When the sides still encounter severe difficulty in overcoming the built-up bitterness and grievances of a protracted conflict, and in altering their hostile perceptions and mutual fears, they may fail to stabilize peace relations. Reconciliation is therefore a crucial factor in stabilizing a peace after the resolution of an international conflict and in transforming the relations between former enemies. Reconciliation, then, goes beyond conflict resolution and addresses the cognitive and emotional barriers to normalization and stabilization of peace relations.

In its simplest form, reconciliation means restoring friendship and harmony between the rival sides after conflict resolution, or transforming relations of hostility and resentment to friendly and harmonious ones. Most of the literature on reconciliation does not refer to international conflicts but rather to conflicts ranging from family to inter-communal and ethnic ones and civil wars. Reconciliation may take place within divided societies or within one country after inter-ethnic, inter-racial, or inter-religious conflicts; which tend to be protracted, zero-sum conflicts, involve extensive violence, cost many casualties, and accumulate animosity and hatred.

Reconciliation is not necessary for ending all international conflict but probably only for conflicts that are protracted and zero-sum, and thus similar to internal conflicts and civil wars. The historical record shows that reconciliation proved necessary for stabilizing peace relations between Germany and France, Germany and Poland, and Germany and the Czech Republic; probably it will also be required in the Arab-Israeli conflict, particularly the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Various studies suggest different conditions that the sides need to fulfil so as to facilitate the reconciliation process during the post-peace agreement period, in which reconciliation is urgently required. Whereas the liberal approach in international relations emphasises the need to accelerate the security, economic, and political cooperation between the sides, thereby enabling the peace to spill over from ruling elites to all sectors of the population, the social psychological approach stresses the cognitive and emotional aspects of reconciliation.

According to the social psychological approach, the reconciliation process should openly address painful questions of past conflict so as to build a foundation for normal peace relations. This may require unilateral or mutual forgiveness, an offer of appropriate compensation, a mutual perception of a just peace agreement (that is, one that is responsive to the needs and fears of both sides), mutual satisfaction with the peace agreement and with the development of the relations, mutual acceptance and respect for each other's national identity, internalisation of the peace values, and a willingness to open a new chapter in the relationship.

Since reconciliation is a mutual and consensual process, it cannot be imposed by one side or even by an external entity (that is, a mediator). The process is likely to develop naturally and slowly, with direction or intervention by the leadership, who must be accountable for its role if the process is to succeed. Both sides' leaders should act simultaneously and jointly in encouraging the internalization of the peace relations and their spill-over to all domains of life and all sectors of society.

Questions:

1) What does reconciliation do that conflict resolution doesn't? (2 pts)

2) List the words used in the text to describe pre-and post-reconciliation situations in states previously involved in conflict.

Draw a table:

pre-reconciliation	post-reconciliation
--------------------	---------------------

--	--

(10 pts + bonus pts)

3) According to the text, theories about reconciliation were originally developed for international situations. Only later were they applied to more local conflicts. True or false? Support your answer by quoting from the text. (2 pts)

4) What causes does the text suggest for conflicts within one country? (3 pts)

5) According to the text, a reconciliation process is not required after every international conflict. True or false? Quote from the text to support your answer. (2 pts)

6) What are the particular features of international conflicts requiring reconciliation, and in these, what other types of conflict do they resemble? (4 pts)

7) The text gives some examples of conflicts where reconciliation was necessary. Can you think of any other examples? (2 pts)

8) Which two schools of thought in international relations are mentioned in the text? (2 pts)

9) In both theories, it is considered important to do what? (2 pts)

10) What are your own theories about how to improve international relations? Write about 150 words. (15 pts)

Total: ___/44 x 0,49 = ___/20